UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,635	10/17/2001	David Thompson	BRDC:039	7014

29395	7590	11/02/2005

H. DALE LANGLEY, JR.
THE LAW FIRM OF H. DALE LANGLEY, JR. PC
610 WEST LYNN
AUSTIN, TX 78703

EXAMINER
BILGRAMI, ASGHAR H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2005*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 October 2001* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   Claim 14 objected to because of the following informalities: Following spelling errors

are corrected by the examiner for examining purposes: representable = represented;

communicatably= communicably. Appropriate correction is required.   ·

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   Claims 1-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamming et al

(U.S. 6,144,997).

3.   As per claims 1, 7, 11, 14 & 18 Lamming disclosed a communications network for

communicating at least one type of a data (Figure 1 & col.4, lines 1-35), wherein the data is

represented by a token, comprising: a server device; a tokenization server communicably

accessible to the server device; a first data at the server device a dictionary communicably

accessible to the tokenization server; a token of the dictionary indicative of the first data,

available to the tokenization server via lookup in the dictionary (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines

43-66); and a communications device communicably connected to the server device (col.5, lines

30-60); wherein the token server communicates to the server device the token indicative of the

first data (col.4, lines 43-67 & col.5, lines 1-16); and wherein the server device communicates

the token, but not the first data, to the communications device (col.5, lines 30-62). Although

Lamming did not explicitly disclose a lookup table in the dictionary indicative of the data stored

in the server. However lamming disclosed a database 14, which associates each electronic

document with a document reference, or token. At the time the invention was made it would

have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the use of database

which is indicative of the stored data through the use of reference or token.

4.   As per claim 2 Lamming disclosed the communications network of claim 1, further

comprising a client device communicatively connected to the queue for receiving the information

communicated over the network (col.7, lines 64-67 & col.8, lines 1-16).

5.   As per claim 3 Lamming disclosed the communications network of claim 2, further

comprising a server including the parser and the queue; wherein the server transmits the distinct

data type of the queue in accordance with a pre-determined priority with respect to transmission

sequence of the information not comprising the distinct data type (col.7, lines 64-67 & col.8,

lines 1-16).

6.   As per claims 7 & 11 Lamming disclosed a method of communications, wherein a client

device communicates with a server computer over a network, comprising the steps of: receiving

an information by the server computer; pre-processing the information to ascertain sequences of

data of the information identifiable to pre-defined token identifiers of the sequences; sending the

pre-defined identifiers to represent the information, but not the entirety of the information itself

(col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-66).

7. As per claim 8 Lamming disclosed the method of claim 7, further comprising the steps of: receiving the pre-defined identifiers; and converting the pre-de-fined identifiers to obtain the entirety of the information (col.4, lines 43-66).

8. As per claim 9 Lamming disclosed the method of claim 7, wherein the method is performed by a server computer communicatively connected to a client computer (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 1-66).

9. As per claim 10 Lamming disclosed the method of claim 8, wherein the steps of receiving and converting are performed by the client computer (col.4, lines 43-66).

10. As per claim 12 Lamming disclosed the server computer of claim 11, further comprising: a relational database of the defined identifiers(col.4, lines 43-66).

11. As per claim 13 Lamming disclosed the server computer of claim 12, wherein the information is an HTML page and the defined identifiers of the relational database include data sequences indicative of recurring HTML code sequences (col.4, lines 43-66).

12. As per claims 15 & 20 Lamming disclosed the communications network of claim 14, further comprising a token converter communicably connected to the communications device,

for interpreting the token, once received by the communications device, as the first data (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-66).

13.   As per claim 16 Lamming disclosed the communications network of claim 15, wherein the token converter is a software of the communications device (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-66).

14.   As per claim 17 Lamming disclosed the communications network of claim 14, wherein the first data is a hyper text mark-up language (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-66.

15.   As per claim 18 Lamming disclosed t method of tokenizing a first data, comprising the steps of: receiving the first data; comparing the first data in a look-up table of a dictionary accessible to a token server to discern a token representative of the first data; and communicating the a token corresponding to the first data, from the look-up table of the dictionary by the token server (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-66).

16.   As per claim 19 Lamming disclosed the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of: communicating the token, but not the first data, over a network to a communications device.

17.   As per claim 21 Lamming disclosed the method of claim 20, wherein the step of

interpreting is performed via a database of the communications device (col.3, lines 36-67 &

col.4, lines 43-66).

18.   As per claim 22 Lamming disclosed the method of claim 19, wherein the first data is

hyper text mark-up language (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-66).

19.   As per claim 23 Lamming disclosed a method of communications, wherein a client

device communicates with a server computer over a network, comprising the steps of: receiving

an information by the server computer; tokenizing the information to obtain a token indicative of

at least a portion of the information; communicating the token over the network to the client

device (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-66).

20.   As per claim 24 Lamming disclosed the method of claim 23, further comprising the steps

of: receiving the token at the client device; and interpreting the token at the client device as the at

least a portion of the information represented by the token (col.3, lines 36-67 & col.4, lines 43-

66).

Response to Arguments

21.   Applicant's arguments filed 08/15/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

22.   The applicants arguments regarding the amended subject matter introduced in the claims

have been addressed in the claim rejections above.

Conclusion

23.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Asghar Bilgrami whose telephone number is 571-272-3907. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Asghar Bilgrami
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

AB

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100